

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 906

48

EXPERIMENTAL USE OF SELF INSTRUCTIONAL COURSES IN RUSSIAN AND SPANISH BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS.

BY- MCDONALD, PEARL S. BELL, ROBERT
ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, VA.

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-119

PUB DATE APR 64

CONTRACT OEC-3-14-D33

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.09 HC-\$1.64 41P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SPANISH, *RUSSIAN, *PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION,
*AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL AIDS, *AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS,
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA

SELF-INSTRUCTION SUMMER COURSES IN RUSSIAN AND SPANISH WERE OFFERED TO OBTAIN SOME QUALIFIED ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF SUBJECT MATTER, MANNER OF PRESENTATION, AND SUBJECTS. THE PURPOSE WAS TO DEVELOP SOME EVIDENCE OF THE APPROPRIATENESS AND FEASIBILITY OF LATER USE OF THE PROGRAMED COURSES ON A BROADER SCALE. TWELVE SUBJECTS WERE USED FOR THE STUDY. IT WAS CONCLUDED THAT MOTIVATED STUDENTS OF PROVEN LANGUAGE APTITUDE AND EXPERIENCE CAN INSTRUCT THEMSELVES IN AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE WITH PROGRAMED MATERIALS. (LP)

ED003906

119

EXPERIMENTAL USE OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL
COURSES IN RUSSIAN AND SPANISH
BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Contract OE-3-14-033

Atlington Military School
Atlington, Virginia
April 1961

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from
person or organization originating it. Points of view or opin-
ions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Educa-
tion position or policy.

**EXPERIMENTAL USE OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL
COURSES IN RUSSIAN AND SPANISH
BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS**

The research reported herein was performed
pursuant to a contract with the
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

Robert Bell
Pearl S. McDonald
Arlington County Public Schools
Arlington, Virginia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Problem	1
The Objectives	2
The Subject Matter	3
The Procedures	4
The Students	5
The Experiment	6

**Experimental Use of Self-instructional Courses in Russian and Spanish by
Secondary School Students.**

Summary and Discussions	6
The United States Office of Education supported the study.	10
Evaluation of the Program	12

Contract Number:	OE-3-14-033
Contractor:	Arlington County Public Schools Arlington, Virginia
Principal Investigator:	Pearl S. McDonald, Supervisor Foreign Languages
Associate Investigator:	Robert Bell, Teacher Yorktown High School
Term:	June 1 - September 30, 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Problem	1
The Objectives	2
The Subject Matter	3
The Procedures	4
The Students	4
The Equipment	4
The Schedule	5
Supervision and Control	5
Evaluation and Reports	5
Results and Discussions	6
Student Achievement	6
Student Emotional Reaction	16
The Evaluation of the Programs	17
Conclusions and Recommendations	18
Recommendations for Further Experimentation	18
Appendix 1	21
Appendix 2	25
Appendix 3	28
Appendix 4	33
Appendix 5	35

EXPERIMENTAL USE OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL COURSES IN RUSSIAN AND SPANISH BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

With the intent of obtaining some qualified answers to some of the above questions, Highland High School, in the summer of 1955, undertook to administer the self-instructional courses in Russian and Spanish produced by the University of Michigan under the direction of F. Paul Martin. Both the production and the testing program were conducted under contract with the United States Office of Education.

THE PROBLEM

Efforts at self-instruction in a second language have been more or less successful since the advent of recorded sound. The technical advances, the recognition of the urgent national need for ability to communicate in many languages, the population explosion, the teacher shortage, all triggered by World War II, have hastened the effort to develop scientifically sound procedures and programs of self-instruction in foreign languages.

Theoretically, the basic experiences of language learning, commonly diffused over several years of childhood, can be selected, arranged, and focused intently for a much briefer span of time so as to produce satisfactory, if not equal, results. Natural language learning processes, beginning with listening and proceeding through mimicry to independent response, concentrated into hours of purposeful practice, can result in the ability to use the language.

The arrangement of this series of experiences, following careful analysis of the structural similarities and differences between the native language and the foreign language, is designed to resolve learning problems. The content of the program is supposedly structured in logical, minimal steps, each followed by verification of the student's success - a reward intended for psychological reinforcement.

But programing is also the art of predicting human reaction to such a carefully constructed sequence of language learning experiences. Language learning supposedly takes place most readily when the desire or need to communicate with another person is keenest. But - communication between student and machine? Between student and text? Between student and recording? How essential is the interplay of human personality? To what can the student relate? Programed self-instruction courses require an exceptional degree of intrinsic motivation. A problem peculiar to the programing of a foreign language is the matter of providing for a semblance of direct communication.

Experimentation with subject matter, manner of presentation, and subjects is necessary. That which is programed for one group may or may not succeed with another. Age, maturity, and motivation are involved. Self-instruction is a self-imposed discipline. How well do students of high school age impose such discipline upon themselves? What factors are conducive to such self-discipline? Might programed self-instruction under certain circumstances be expected to ease the present situation of much demand for foreign language instruction and too few teachers?

THE OBJECTIVES

With the intent of obtaining some qualified answers to some of the above questions, Yorktown High School, in the summer of 1963, undertook to administer the self-instructional courses in Russian and Spanish produced by the University of Michigan under the direction of F. Rand Morton. Both the production and the testing program were conducted under contract with the United States Office of Education.

The general purpose as stated in the contract was "to develop some evidence of the appropriateness and feasibility of later use of the programmed courses on a broader scale at this level of instruction."

The questions to which specific answers were sought are:

1. To what degree are the resultant abilities to understand and speak comparable to the same abilities acquired in the customary teacher-text-classroom situation? Are they adequate to permit the student to join a second level class for successful continuance of his study?
2. What are the intellectual, emotional, and physical factors that influence the reaction of high school students to self-instruction?
3. What areas, frames, or portions of the program evoke student behavior indicative of satisfactory or unsatisfactory programming?

Certain matters of considerable interest might have been investigated had more students been available and rigid controls possible. Some would require an extended period of time, others would demand parallel programming for comparison. Control groups would have been desirable. Chief among these matters are:

1. To what extent does previous study of a language influence success?
2. To what extent does association with other students, other materials, other sources of information affect achievement?
3. Does frustration attendant to long periods of mimicry without knowing the significance offset the advantages of efforts to focus the attention upon sound production and mechanical structure mastery?
4. Does this fairly long period of mimicry and oral manipulation of structure "set the stage" for more rapid progress leading to a finally higher level of proficiency.

THE SUBJECT MATTER

1. Spoken American Spanish (An Experimental Programed Audio-Lingual Self-Instructional Course) a 696 frame sequence produced by a staff working under the direction of F. Rand Morton, divided thus:

Task I	Phonematization	frames 1-250
Task II	Vocalization	frames 251-300
Task III	Acoustic Signifiers	frames 450-594
Task IV	Structural Patterns	frames 600-699

Recordings:

68 7-inch tapes recorded on two tracks at $7\frac{1}{2}$ ips.

2. Programed Russian ALLP - produced by a staff working under the direction of F. Rand Morton and divided thus:

Task I	Phonematization of the Sounds of Russian	frames 1-2 Problems 1-22
Task II	Vocalization	Problems 1-15
Task III	Acoustic Signifiers	Problems 1-35
Task IV	Structural Patterns	Problems 1-13

Recordings:

55 7-inch tapes recorded on one track at $3\frac{3}{4}$ ips.

Pacing is at the discretion of the student. He may stop the tape at any time for correction or repetition, regardless of whether his response is expected to be given within a limited time.

As indicated by the title, the Spanish program is for the development of audio-lingual skills only. Shorthand symbols substitute for the written word. The Spanish program is reported as a finished project.

The Russian program introduces early cursive writing and reading, and in the fourth task the printed word. This program is in an unfinished state, having been in the process of development for approximately one year.

The student manuals require written answers to most of the frames. The recordings provide verification of the students' responses.

Provision is made in the student manual for recording the student's reactions, problems, progress reports, and suggestions. Inasmuch as the Russian program is incomplete, missing frames, missing recording, faulty confirmation, and other discrepancies occur!

THE PROCEDURES

The Students

Several weeks in advance of the opening date of the experiment, it was described to a select group of students and a request for volunteer participants was issued. Student participation in the experiment was entirely voluntary. From among the applicants, twelve students were chosen. They were students of high scholastic achievement. No effort was made to select students with special aptitudes for foreign language study, but all had previously studied successfully one or more foreign languages. Each was a beginner in the language studied in the experiment. Six chose to undertake the Russian course, six the Spanish course. They were told that they would be permitted to join a class in progress to attempt the second level of the language studied during the academic year 1963-64. Time requirements and the reports expected of them were explained. Only after they had agreed to all stipulations were they informed that they would be paid a nominal sum for participating in the experiment.

The Equipment

Each student was provided with a set of the recordings of the course, a student workbook, and a portable dual channel tape recorder. The equipment permitted the student to hear his own voice in the headphones and to record and play back his efforts as he chose. The group was assembled in one air-conditioned classroom and, for the most part, remained there, with the exception of temporary transfers necessitated by summer work on the building.

1. Task I

Wollensak "1500 Monophonic Recorder

Specifications:

Frequency response 40-15,000 CPS - 3db at $7\frac{1}{2}$ ips; 40-8,000 CPS - 3db at $3\frac{3}{4}$ ips.
Signal to noise ratio 48 db.
Wow and flutter less than .3%.
Distortion less than .8%.

Headset: Brush A-200

Specifications:

Frequency response 100-5,000 CPS.

2. Task II - IV

Dualcorder Dual Channel Tape Recorder

Specifications:

Frequency response 40-12,000 CPS.

Headset: Brush A-200

Specifications: As above.

Microphone: Turner 20X

Specifications:

Frequency response 50-10,000 CPS.

Magnetic tape recordings

The Spanish tapes were professional recordings (duplications) at 3 3/4 ips.

The Russian tapes for Tasks I and II were professional recordings (duplications). The tapes for Tasks III and IV were language laboratory (Monitor equipment Tape deck: Viking 75) recordings of satisfactory quality. All were at 7 1/2 ips.

The Schedule

Student work began on June 24, and lasted until September 1, or until the course was completed. The students agreed to spend at least five hours daily, Monday through Friday. Some spent six hours daily in practice. Others were permitted to carry equipment home over the week-end. Each worked at his own speed, took breaks when he felt the necessity, kept a record of his time and his reactions.

Supervision and Control

A minimum of supervision was provided. Students were taught to handle the equipment, and left to their own devices. The project director and a student assistant kept records and made attendance and progress reports as required daily and at intervals of two weeks. Policing was not provided. No effort was made to prevent communication with one another or with language students and teachers involved in the summer session and located in adjoining classrooms. Use of other materials was not prohibited. Conversation with friends, family, and visitors was not prohibited. Among the visitors were members of the Office of Education Research Division who conversed with the students on four or five occasions.

Evaluation and Reports

Progress reports were required of each student and the director every two weeks. Each student submitted as many reports as he wished. The director submitted attendance reports, progress reports, and subjective evaluation of the students' reactions.

Reports were submitted to the United States Office of Education and to those responsible for the development of the program at the University of Michigan.

Formal evaluation of the students' achievement has been by the use of the MLA Cooperative standardized tests in comprehension and speaking. Subsequent progress of some students in a regular second-level class has been observed.

An analysis of the personal ability and experience factors involved in the students' achievement, as summarized in Tables II and III, has been undertaken.

Director and student informal reports have been studied in relation to (1) student progress, (2) student emotional reaction, and (3) indications of deficiencies in the programs in use.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Student Achievement

The most important objective of this experiment was to determine the achievement of the students in terms of ability to comprehend and speak the language. The standard of measurement is the achievement of students in the conventional classroom situation. Performance on standardized tests and the ability to fit into a conventional class were examined.

1. The Tests

Student performance on the MLA Cooperative tests, validated on nationwide teacher-text-classroom situations, indicates that the ability to comprehend and speak Spanish as acquired by the use of programmed self-instruction is comparable to the high achievement that might have been expected of these students in a teacher-text course.

The same cannot be said of the results achieved with the Russian program. Inasmuch as the students of Russian were of the same caliber as the Spanish students and worked under the same conditions, similar results might be expected. But the scores are so low as to indicate an undeniable dissimilarity of course content as found in the Michigan Programmed Russian Course and the conventional course.

The achievement of the students as measured by the MLA Cooperative tests is indicated in Table I in terms of scores and percentile rank as compared with national norms. Table II presents pertinent personal data. Table III is a Progress Report.

Throughout this report, code numbers are used in lieu of student names, S- indicating a Spanish student, R- indicating a Russian student. No significance or implication of rating is involved in the accompanying digit.

a. The Tabulations of Scores (Tables)

TABLE 1

MLA COOPERATIVE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TESTS, FORM LA
YORKTOWN HIGH SCHOOL - 1963

SPANISH	STUDENT	RAW SCORE	CONVERTED SCORE	PERCENTILE BAND	MIDDLE PERCENTILE RANK
S-1 Listening		37	174	98-99.8	99
S-1 Speaking		34	159	77-99	88
S-2 Listening		09	139	3-28	09
S-2 Speaking		20	143	10-53	24
S-3 Listening		25	159	82-94	88
S-3 Speaking		30	154	63-95	81
S-4 Listening		30	165	91-97	95
S-4 Speaking		24	147	24-70	38
S-5 Listening		27	161	87-95	91
S-5 Speaking		25	149	30-77	53
S-6 Listening		35	171	96-99.1	98
S-6 Speaking		53	181	above 99 (highest on record)	99
<u>RUSSIAN</u>					
R-1 Listening		18	143	18-51	33
R-1 Speaking		27		15-39	27
R-2 Listening		19	144	28-60	45
R-2 Speaking		22		8-24	13
R-3 Listening		09	133	3-8	2
R-3 Speaking		30		24-49	36
R-4 Listening		13	137	3-18	12
R-4 Speaking		24		10-20	16
R-5 Listening		18	143	18-51	33
R-5 Speaking		27		15-39	27
R-6 Listening		38	164	94-98	97
R-6 Speaking		48		86-97	93

TABLE 11
PERSONAL DATA

SPANISH									
Student	Grade	IQ	SCAT Score	SCAT Percentile Rank	CEEB Fr. Comp. Score	Previous For. Lang. Studied	Previous For. Lang. Mark	Present Language Studied	
S-1	12	114	300	99		Russian I	A	Russian II	
S-2	11	102	319	99.5		French III	B	French IV	
S-3	11	96	304	95	667	French III	B	French IV	
S-4	12	147	323	100		French IV German I	A	German II	
S-5	11	126	298	90	706	French III	B	French IV Spanish II	
S-6	12	127	327	100		French IV	A	French V Spanish II	
R-1	11	124	316	99.5	706	Latin I French III	A	French IV	
R-2	11	135	308	97	697	French III	A	French IV Russian II	
R-3	12	127	312	99		French III	A	Russian II	
R-4	11	117	306	96	619	French III	B	French IV	
R-5	11	139	311	98	658	French III	A	French IV	
R-6	12	144	*			Latin II Spanish II	A	Russian II	

*Did not take test.

TABLE III

PROGRESS REPORT ON RUSSIAN-SPANISH SELF-INSTRUCTION

SPANISH	July 1		July 15		July 30		Aug. 30 (Final)	
	Student	Hours Frame Completed	Hours	Task Frame	Hours	Task Frame	Hours	Task
S-1	32	Task 1	79	III 471	122	III 574	200	IV
S-2	42½	229	85½	II 413	120	III 488B	200	III
S-3	56	232	104½	III 465A	147	III 552	200	IV
S-4	38	Task 1	71½	III 474	89	III 531A	205	III Frame 645
S-5	46	240	79	III P6	112	III 531D	200	IV
S-6	38	Task 1	74	III 474	100	III 574	200	IV
<u>RUSSIAN</u>								
R-1	49	P1-F1-Task 11	101	III P2F2	134	III P13F4	230	IV
R-2	44	P1-F1-Task 11	90	III P1F7	133	III P11F4	200	III
R-3	38½	P1-F1-Task 11	86	III P8F5	130	III P32F6	120	IV
R-4	34½	P1-F19-Task 11	73	III P12F6	107	IV P3F5	200	IV
R-5	49	P6-F20-Task 1	111	II P8F13	150	III P4F1	250	III
R-6	40½	P3-F4-Task 11	94	III P11F2	143	IV P3F1	250	IV

b. Factors Seeming to Affect Test Scores

A number of factors that might be expected to attest to the achievement of the students are to be found in Table II. It will be observed that their relative percentile achievement rank in a number of items would indicate that somewhat similar achievement in the experiment language should be expected. However, such has not been the case. One must first look to the instrument of measurement.

(1) The validity of the tests - a question: Student scores on the MLA Spanish listening and speaking tests would seem to indicate that the tests were valid. However, an examination of the content of the course and the student reactions to the tests (see Appendix No. 4) raises certain questions as to the validity. Both vocabulary and the required oral reading are in question. The same questions are applicable to the Russian tests where very low scores certainly indicate more definite discrepancies. Both groups complain of inadequate vocabulary to describe the commonplace situations depicted in the tests. The Russian students were especially vocative regarding this matter.

There is much greater justification for questioning the validity of the reading portion of the tests; inasmuch as the students had not seen the printed word and practiced oral reading, their complaints regarding the reading portion of the speaking test seem well-founded. Ten of the possible thirty-eight items of the test are in this section. Their achievement on this portion of the test supports their position. Of the ten points possible on this section of the test, the maximum score in Russian was 60%, in Spanish, 70%, of the possible score. In both languages the minimum score was 30% of the possible score. Average achievement of the Spanish group on this part of the test was 48%, of the Russian group, 38%.

Whether the Spanish test is in all respects valid or not, the students' total scores indicate that the programmed self-instruction course is at least the equivalent of the conventional course. As for the Russian course, the conclusion to be drawn from the test scores is less decisive. If these students did not learn what the test sought to identify, what did they learn? Why is what they learned apparently applicable in their second level study of the language?

(2) Ability to discriminate between sounds - how accurate are sound discrimination and production? Of serious concern in regard to the success of self-instruction in pronunciation are the limitations suggested by the results of that portion of the test having to do with pronunciation and intonation. An analysis of the portion of the speaking test requiring mimicry of phonemes raises a serious question of the student's ability to discriminate between sounds - both those he hears and those he produces.

On the ten basic sounds and five intonation patterns to be imitated, student achievement scores were as follows:

1 student	- 4 sounds
5 students	- 6 sounds
2 students	- 8 sounds
2 students	-11 sounds
1 student	-12 sounds
1 student	-13 sounds

The total score of sounds produced accurately is 97 - slightly over 53% of the possible total of 180 sounds.

Any consideration of inadequate listening conditions was eliminated by a test administered to the equipment used. A variable frequency audio oscillator was fed into the input of the recorder and recorded. A playback of the recording and a spot check test by listening with the headset used indicated a maximum performance of 12,000 CPS, a level certainly adequate for speech-sound discrimination.

Considering that two of the four tasks of each course dealt with sound discrimination and production and that students spent from fifty to eighty hours on these exercises, one would feel that the rewards were so small in most cases as to indicate that self-instruction by senior high school students in a foreign language produces only an approximation of the sounds of that language. Study of the students' evaluation of their own progress and achievement also leads to questioning of their power of discrimination.

Yet, teachers working with these students in Level II consistently appraise their pronunciation as "better than class-taught pronunciation." It may be that "programed pronunciation" should be accompanied by a synchronized filmstrip by means of which the student can view the "postures" of correct pronunciation. Perhaps he should have a small TV camera and screen to view his own efforts.

(3) Achievement in related areas: Some of the frequently used criteria for prediction of success in foreign language study are teacher marks indicating achievement in previous foreign language study, I.Q. as measured by accepted tests (California Mental Maturity in this case), and the pupil score on the verbal portion of the SCAT. These items, as assembled on Table II, have been studied to determine what correlation could be observed. The report of the Research Department follows:

There were statistically significant correlations at the 10% significance level between the following test scores:

- (a) I.Q. and Russian Listening (+0.75).
- (b) SCAT Verbal Ability and Russian Speaking (+0.82).

As shown in the following table, none of the other findings were statistically significant.

CORRELATION OF	Number of Cases	Coefficient of Correlation	Probable Error
I.Q. with:			
Spanish Listening	6	+ 0.47	± 0.21
Spanish Speaking	6	+ 0.12	± 0.27
Russian Listening	6	+ 0.75*	± 0.12
Russian Speaking	6	+ 0.60	± 0.18
SCAT Verbal with:			
Spanish Listening	6	- 0.41	± 0.23
Spanish Speaking	6	- 0.21	± 0.26
Russian Listening	5 [#]	+ 0.12	± 0.30
Russian Speaking	5 [#]	+ 0.82*	± 0.10

*Statistically significant at the 10% level of significance.

[#]One pupil had not taken SCAT.

Test results definitely show that step-by-step individual procedure through programed material does not produce equally proficient performance from all members of each language group. However, there is a rather narrow range of performance with an occasional notable and explainable exception. It is reasonable to expect that uniform learning experiences based on small sequential successes should result in fairly uniform terminal performance. Thus, aptitudes and special abilities, having been ruled out of the experience, should not be expected to correlate with the results. Does the fact that no correlation shows in the case of the Spanish students indicate that this particular program has achieved its goal?

The significance of the correlation of the Russian scores with the I.Q. and the SCAT verbal scores is noteworthy. Why should this be true of the Russian and not the Spanish? Conjecture is all that is possible. Could the explanation lie in the application of the theory of programing? Admittedly, the Spanish program is much more highly refined than the Russian. If progression from degree to degree of well-programed (Spanish) material is truly painless and error-free, then does the achievement based on the unfinished Russian program indicate a necessary application of intelligence and acquired verbal skill?

The causes for both group and individual variations must be sought in the data assembled in Tables II and III.

(4) Previous language study: For lack of a control group or groups, it is impossible to deduce the effect of previous language study. Yet, comments from the Spanish students strongly indicate (and reasonably) that previously-learned French was a contributor to their understanding and acquisition of Spanish.

The effect upon the study of Russian of previously-learned French, however, is not obvious. But, it may be observed, the high scorer in Russian had already studied Latin for two years. No doubt some experience with similar structures such as declensions was valuable to him.

It would have been interesting to know what similar students without previous language experience would have accomplished under the same circumstances.

(5) Time, speed, and content: Some of the factors that contributed to individual achievement or lack of achievement may also be located in Table III. Still other factors are suggested by the student and director progress reports as found in the Appendix. Some factors are a matter of pure speculation.

In the case of S-2, whose scores are low on both the listening and speaking tests, the most significant item on record may be the indication of the progress report (Table III) that the student was consistently slower than the other students and finished only Task III, although approximately the same amount of time was spent. S-4, whose score on speaking was likewise low, indicated having completed approximately only one-half of Task IV. The lexical content of Task IV is obviously of considerable importance.

(6) Supplementation of content: The one remarkable variation among the Russian scores is that of R-6, whose special achievement may be due to supplementation of the programmed course with constant use of a dictionary and a text entitled Russian Without a Teacher by G. Bronsky.¹ It may also be observed on the Progress Report, Table III, that R-6 was one of the two students who spent the greatest amount of time on the course.

The unusually low listening score of R-3 elicited an inquiry into the student's hearing ability, but this was found to be normal. The fact that this student rushed through the materials in considerably less time than the other students may indicate the cause for the relatively lower achievement.

2. The Continuum - Class Performance

Student performance on the standardized tests is not the only basis upon which the achievement is reckoned. A second consideration is the adjustment of the student to the work of a second level conventional class. Six of the students chose to continue the study of the experiment language. The other six were committed to a sequence of a different language.

¹ Bronsky, G., Russian Without a Teacher. New York: Authentic Publishers, Inc., 636 Eleventh Avenue.

a. Grades

All indications are that the six students have joined a second level class with a better than average likelihood of success. At the time of the writing of this report, the end of the third marking period, their grades on Level II are as follows:

<u>Spanish</u>	<u>Russian</u>
S-5 - B B B	R-2 - B A B
S-6 - A A A	R-3 - B A A
	R-4 - B B B
	R-6 - A A A

A more objective comparison of their achievement with that of the other members of the class will be obtained by administering a standardized test at the end of the course.

The students' adjustment to the conditions of the Level II course cannot be taken to indicate relative contents or qualities of the materials used or similarities of goals and achievement of the two Level I preparations. According to the test scores, R-2, R-3, and R-4 were very poorly prepared to continue with success. Yet they do so! The high adaptability and strong perseverance of the individual student, so evident in the summer program, may well be the intangible factors that have supported his subsequent efforts.

b. Teacher Evaluation of Student Performance in Level II

The teachers in whose second level classes the students were placed were asked to compare their performance with that of the other students who had received the conventional type of instruction. The following reports were submitted at the end of the first marking period:

Russian (Class text: A-LM Level II, Harcourt, Brace & World)

(1) Strengths of experiment students: A greater overall command of grammar (structure) which is rapidly evaporating due to lack of use (A-LM covers grammar at a slower rate).

(2) Weaknesses

- (a) Difficulty in structuring sentences
- (b) Difficulty in comprehending (due in part to a difference in vocabulary)
- (c) Difficulty in conversing freely (due in part to a difference in vocabulary)

(3) Comments: After two weeks reading and writing abilities were on a par with those of the other students in spite of the difference in vocabulary. Due to the high motivation of the students and a certain amount of adjustment on our part at the beginning, the initial difficulties are being overcome rapidly.

Spanish (Class text: Turk, El Camino Real, Houghton Mifflin Co.)

(1) Strengths: Pronunciation - excellent! Oral comprehension - very good. Ability to carry on simple conversations.

(2) Weaknesses: Verbs: One student has completely overcome a deficiency in verbs. The other student is floundering in this respect, but her oral proficiency has been such as to compensate in computing her grade. In general, she is weak in ability to manipulate grammatical structures. The third student who dropped the course after a short while because of schedule problems did not appear to have such difficulty with grammar. The reading comprehension of both students is excellent, better than average.

c. Student Evaluations of Their Own Performance in the Regular Course

At the end of the first marking period, the students were asked to submit answers to the following questions: How well do you think the summer program prepared you for the second level? What strengths do you now see in the program? What weaknesses do you now see in the program?

The replies in detail follow:

Russian

R-2: The program, as far as I got, does not combine with the A-LM Russian II course. The grammar is not as well done as it could be, i.e., there should be more explanation of how and why the forms are used. The vocabulary is fair, and can be built up with about five or six weeks of A-LM. The method of approach to teaching is well done. I know that all of us that continued to Russian II have better pronunciation than the others (on the average). I feel sure that completion of the entire course would have helped me a lot.

R-6: The only real trouble I had was vocabulary differences. The rest was just remembering things which we had learned in the course but had forgotten. I particularly liked the drill, drill, drill technique in the course. This helped when I had to remember something in class. I still think a vocabulary should be introduced earlier than the third task. Other than that and the mistakes in the tapes, I think the program is quite good.

Spanish

S-5: I think the summer program prepared me fairly well for Spanish II. This first grading period I got a B. I would probably have gotten an A if it hadn't been for the verbs. I find the verbs extremely hard and that is because the summer program did not do a good job in teaching me verbs. That was the major weakness in the program. Surprisingly enough, vocabulary is not a problem! This has surprised me very much.

The course did a very good job in teaching pronunciation. It

has been a tiny bit hard for me to learn spelling. I am still having problems learning where and when to put accents, but I'm sure this problem will be solved. My main concern is verbs. Other than that, I am having no problems with Spanish II.

S-6: I think it prepared me very well. Although I had started to forget, I find much of the material coming back to me as we get into it in class. I seem to have trouble with irregular verbs, although I usually know my mistakes because they sound wrong.

The program has done a great deal to train my ear for Spanish; I think it helped a lot with my accent and with my facility in speaking. Spanish sounds much more natural to me and I can think in it easily. I think this is due to the program.

I still think it was a little extreme - more of the usual grammatical terminology might have been used. I don't know if all that shorthand was necessary either, although even now I sometimes write things out mentally in it. Incidentally, I was very worried about starting Spanish II and I'm really surprised at how easy it is. I'm not sure how much is due to the program and how much is due to my five years of French which help a lot.

Student Emotional Reaction

Any effort to analyze the emotional reaction of the students is necessarily subjective. The persons who observed them regularly and periodically never ceased to wonder what motivation separated these twelve students from summer vacation activities and held them to five or more hours per day of machine manipulation and patient production of foreign sounds all too often absolutely without lexical significance. A few factors were reasonably evident:

1. There was a challenge to "stick-it-out" posed by the unfavorable newspaper implication that they were there because "they were paid to study foreign languages."
2. There was an esprit de corps - an element especially potent for this age group. Mutual encouragement and helpfulness were evident.
3. There was a certain amount of friendly rivalry, with just appraisal of the other's achievement.
4. There was the fact that each intensely-interested-in-language student felt that his participation in the experiment was a contribution to language teaching-learning technology.
5. There was the fact that each was to receive a stipend of \$150.

But, above all, there was evidence in daily written reports and behavior that, for the most part, these students felt a sense of achievement - of success in spite of frustrations - of expectation of later successes in more advanced study of the language.

A study of the students' evaluation of their progress in the subsequent courses (see pages 15 and 16) indicates that this motivation held firm. Moreover, their achievement as evinced by teachers' grades would indicate some justification for this attitude. An interesting aspect of the effect of a sense of achievement upon success may be emphasized by the fact that as yet (end of the third quarter of the school year) those students whose test scores were discouragingly low continue to achieve, knowing absolutely nothing of what the tests indicated!

On the other hand, of frustration and discouragement there was a due amount! This was particularly true of the Russian students who were working with an imperfectly developed program. These reactions are clearly depicted in their daily reports, in their comments in the text margins, and in their final summary of their reactions to the program. Excerpts from these are to be found in the appendices of this report.

Language teachers, school personnel, and parents who are concerned that automation may take over the field of education, and all those who have a horror of an inhuman teaching machine may comfort themselves with the fact that never did the students relate to the machine they used. For ten weeks they sat before those tape recorders and communicated with the unseen, unknown people to whose recorded voices they listened. In some cases, the "you" to whom they addressed their comments was obviously the author(s) of the program. To these human beings they addressed protests, sincere advice, vituperations, volleys of criticism, prayers, praise, and sincere expressions of appreciation.

That the students would have appreciated the personal concern and assistance of interested adults was quite evident. They were eager to discuss their efforts, their achievement, to try out their skills in a give-and-take communication with a live speaker of the language. The few occasions on which this opportunity was provided were sincerely appreciated. Occasionally among their comments there were subtle revelations of the need for teacher encouragement and assistance to which all their years of schooling had conditioned them. However, there was no evidence of any traumatic experience.

In view of the wide range of achievement and the obvious conclusions that certain personality factors were responsible for the variations, one must wonder what might have been the effect upon the performance of low-achievers had they had a little evaluation, assistance, and encouragement from interested teachers at the right time.

The Evaluation of the Programs

One purpose of the experiment was to provide guinea pigs for the programmers to test the adequacy of the material and application of programming methodology. It is not the function of this report to attempt to evaluate the results of this aspect of the experiment.

Student reactions were recorded in their study manuals, frame by frame. Problems, criticism, suggestions are all there. These manuals have been made available to the programmers for whatever use they may make of them. In addition, student daily reports, the director's bi-monthly reports, and all written reactions to various aspects of the program, including this report, are made available to the programmers.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Highly motivated students of proven language aptitude and experience can instruct themselves in an additional language with programed materials.

Such students can join a Level II class, adapt to class procedures, and pursue their study successfully.

For such students, the University of Michigan Spoken American Spanish programed audio-lingual course is adequate. Programed Russian ALLP, as developed to date, is less satisfactory, so much so that its use could be recommended only under very particular conditions. Only students of exceptional motivation can be expected to withstand the boredom, frustrations, and discouragements of imperfectly programed learning of such lengthy duration.

Evaluation of student achievement might be more satisfactory if based upon tests known to be valid for the programed course content.

Group endeavor is probably more successful than isolated individual effort would prove to be. The programs, as now arranged, are not adaptable to use on the usual school schedule of a fifty-five minute period per subject.

Recommendations for Further Experimentation

Hasten the day when programs for self-instruction in a foreign language will consist of film frames, sound, and reflections. A small TV camera will cast upon the screen in close juxtaposition to the image of the teacher, the image of the learner, who thus is enabled to play the double role of participant and observer-critic of his own efforts. A graphic sound recorder will indicate side by side on the screen the native sound patterns and the student's imitations. His reward for a successful performance will be the automatic tripping of the sound-registering device in preparation for reception of the next effort. Video tape will enable him to review his efforts if he wishes.

But in the meanwhile, to experiment further and more satisfactorily with programed self-instruction as a means of offsetting the lack of instructors and meeting the national needs for language skills, a variety of situations in self-instruction might be helpful.

1. Groups of varying abilities and motivation should be established. They should serve as controls for one another and should be matched by similar classroom groups, small in size, using the exact content of the programed course under the supervision of a teacher. Thus can be determined what factors are the most conducive to success and under what conditions time and effort are best conserved.
2. Of considerable interest would be the results obtained by matching a self-instruction group working two hours per day with a class using the teacher-administered program and controlled homework for an equivalent period of time. Experimentation with controlled amounts of teacher assistance might determine to what extent a teacher is essential as a supplement to self-instruction effort.

3. Rigid controls should be exercised over the use of instructional materials other than the program. Communication with other students and persons speaking the language should be controlled - all these in an effort to determine the completeness and quality of the programmed course.

4. Investigation should be made of solitary self-instruction to determine the feasibility of individual use of the programs.

5. Experimentation should be set up to compare the result from varying amounts of time spent in meaningless sound identification and production and the results of shorter periods of time spent identifying and reproducing the same sounds in meaningful context.

6. Similar experiments should determine the efficacy of presenting structure in both meaningless and meaningful context to determine to what extent the learning of meaning and structure may be combined or should be divorced.

7. A prolonged observation of the progress of self-instructed students should be undertaken to determine whether they progress because of their foundation or because of personality factors that overcome handicaps. They might be matched with a group of equal caliber which began Level II without previous instruction. It is a known fact that very able students sooner or later overcome the handicaps of a delayed beginning when placed in a group in progress.

8. The Russian ALLP Course should be further developed and refined. It should be made available to interested students who do not have access to class instruction. Some provision should be made for reduction of the expense in order to encourage the study of the language. Rental might be feasible. The tape recordings should definitely be on single track if the student is to derive some benefit from self-recording and playback.

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX

The Director's Bi-Monthly Reports

July 1, 1964

Excerpts from Reports

The excerpts from various reports included in this Appendix have been selected as typical of those revealing student and director reactions and evaluations.

Appendix 1. The Director's
Bi-Monthly Reports

Evaluation of the Programs

Evaluation of the Experiment and Recommendations

Appendix 2. The Students' Daily Reports

Appendix 3. The Students' Final Remarks on Self-Instruction

Appendix 4. The Students' Reactions to the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Test as It Relates to the Self-Instructional Course

Appendix 5. The Teacher's Appraisal of Student Progress in Level II

July 30, 1964

1. As of July 30, most of the students are still enthusiastic about the course. They are working hard and seem to feel that they are learning at a satisfactory pace. Their major criticisms of the course deal mainly with matters that can be corrected by revision of the course material to include certain frames that are missing on the tapes, the correction of many symbols that are incorrectly drawn, the numbering of course pages, more time for responses, etc.

APPENDIX I

The Director's Bi-Monthly Reports

July 1, 1964:

1. The students are indicating in their workbooks what they feel are the problems connected with each lesson. I suggest that S-6's workbook be consulted for comments on the Spanish program and R-4's for the Russian.
2. The students have been asked to submit a short statement after each day's work. These statements reflect the students' criticisms of the course. Since it would be impractical to duplicate the statements of each student, the entire sheaf of student day-to-day criticisms is being enclosed.
3. As of July 1, the students are still enthusiastic about the course. They are working hard and seem to feel that they are learning at a satisfactory pace. Their major criticisms of the course deal mainly with matters that can be corrected by revision of the course material to include certain frames that are incorrectly drawn, the numbering of course pages, more time for responses, etc.

July 15, 1964

1. As of July 15, the students are still enthusiastic about the course. They are working hard and seem to feel that they are learning at a satisfactory pace. Their major criticisms of the course deal mainly with matters that can be corrected by revision of the course material to include certain frames that are missing on the tapes, the correction of many symbols that are incorrectly drawn, the numbering of course pages, more time for responses, etc.
2. The Spanish students were very happy with Task II. Task III is proving difficult. Several students say they feel frustrated and are not able to concentrate a full five hours. Since they are just beginning Task III, perhaps the material will soon become less of a chore.
3. The Russian students are also having considerable trouble with Task III. Most of them feel the sentences are too long to remember. According to the students, many of the tapes need considerable improvement. Some typical comments are: "Sometimes we are given rules to follow 'regardless' of what others are around it. Then in the frame, we get exceptions without being told. In the possessive adjectives, we are given a list of them and then not told which are which! This is very typical of the grammar!"

July 30, 1964

1. As of July 30, most of the students are still enthusiastic about the course. They are working hard and seem to feel that they are learning at a satisfactory pace. Their major criticisms of the course deal mainly with matters that can be corrected by revision of the course material to include certain frames that are missing on the tapes, the correction of many symbols that are incorrectly drawn, the numbering of course pages, more time for responses, etc.

2. Five of the Spanish students are about to finish Task III. They all seem pleased with their progress and feel that the work is easier. One student feels that he will not finish the course, but he will continue to work at it.
3. The Russian students are not too happy. Most of them are still in the frustration stage.

The Director's Evaluation of the Programs

Tasks I and II

The new approach to learning foreign languages which is presented in Tasks I and II appeared to be excellent. The students enjoyed the work, were strongly motivated, and felt a keen sense of achievement. All the students worked diligently with little or no time devoted to "breaks" or idle chatter. The purpose of the work was well understood and no one felt the work was beyond his ability. All the students seemed to feel that this new approach to learning the sound and rhythm of languages was superior to the methods now employed in most schools. Since all the students had recently studied other foreign languages, I feel that they were in a good position to judge the effectiveness of the new approach.

About the only suggestions for improving Tasks I and II were that answers be provided for all the quizzes. The directions in the manuals told the students to hand in their quizzes to the monitor for correction. Since the monitor had no key with which to correct the exercises, this seemed a waste of time and was a little discouraging to the students. Some of the confirmation answers given in several of the frames were obviously incorrect. These can easily be corrected.

The approach used in Tasks I and II might easily be adapted for beginning foreign language students who are going into standard aural-oral courses. The students and I both agree that the new approach is an improvement on other methods even if Tasks III and IV are not used.

Postscript: (six months later)

The teachers of the students who continued their study of the language declare the pronunciation of the students as a result of these tasks to be better than that of the traditionally taught students. The students themselves continue to feel that this method is preferable to the traditional method of acquiring pronunciation.

Task III

Task III was the great stumbling block for the Spanish students. Interest began to lag and there was a corresponding increase in the number of "breaks" and the amount of idle chatter. Most of the students thought that the sentences were too long and that often there was insufficient time for their responses. The students soon tired of switching tenses without knowing what they were saying. There seemed to be little reward for their efforts. All expressed a desire to know what they were saying. The slurring of Spanish word endings was frustrating, e. g., dicere for decir, hablamm for hablamos, etc. The voice of one of the

female speakers was irritating. There seemed to be inadequate drill on the use of the subjunctive.

The great weakness of Task III was its lack of rewards. Some way should be found to give meaning to the sentences. A large percentage of time was spent in imitation of meaningless sounds. A printed Spanish-English glossary to accompany each frame would be a great help. It would let the students know what they were saying, give them a sense of accomplishment, and would help prepare them for Task IV. As it was, the students started looking up words or asking former Spanish students for the meanings of words. This consumed valuable time.

Task III of the Russian program needs to be completely revised. The students felt that they were being rushed through a great deal of grammar which was not clearly presented. All expressed a desire for more complete written explanations of what they were to learn. A number of missing frames and a lack of time in which to respond to certain frames were frustrating. Several students expressed a desire for an orderly presentation of declension endings and what each ending indicated. Several felt that it would be a great help to have the written and printed Russian alphabets presented in their traditional order to help them look up words. All resented being hit by the printed alphabet in Task IV without any previous idea of what it was like.

No one felt that Task III was completely impossible but the general feeling was that clearer explanations, more drill, and a great deal more time should be devoted to this Task, since the material does not seem geared to the time available in the normal public school summer.

Task IV

Most of the Spanish students were able to finish Task IV. All expressed gratification at the amount of Spanish they had learned and at their ability to comprehend what was said. All felt that the stories were interesting and appreciated their content.

All the students had Spanish-English dictionaries which they used extensively in a sometimes vain attempt to find words they did not know. Consulting dictionaries wasted a great deal of time. This could be remedied by a Spanish-English glossary to accompany the stories. Silent letters such as the h in hablar could be placed in brackets. I feel that all the students would have easily finished Task IV and had time for a review if the problem of vocabulary could be solved.

The Russian students were not as satisfied as the Spanish students with their Task IV. The switch to a printed alphabet was an unpleasant surprise. Several students thought that the content was dull. The missing frames of vocabulary proved very frustrating. Most felt that a glossary to accompany each frame would have helped solve the situation. All seemed to feel that the new approach to Russian is basically sound, provided it is thoroughly revised.

The Director's Evaluation of the Experiment and Recommendations

The information given on the personal data sheet indicates that the students who completed the summer program in Russian and Spanish were not average high school students. All but two of the students had I.Q.'s considerably above the average and all of them had previously taken three to five years of French, Latin, or Spanish prior to taking the experimental courses. Four had previously studied two languages.

All the Spanish students indicated that their previous French backgrounds were a tremendous help due to the similarity of the two languages. I believe this was a major factor in the greater success of the Spanish program as compared to the Russian.

It should be pointed out also that the experimental students were a highly motivated group with a keen interest in languages. I feel that a combination of high I.Q., strong motivation, and previous experience in another foreign language were major factors influencing the outcome of the program.

I feel that the results of the MLA Cooperative Achievement Tests do not present a very sound basis for determining what the students accomplished this past summer. The vocabulary needed for the test was based on material found in most standard high school texts and did not relate very well to that contained in Task Four of the programmed courses. A final test should be devised which fits the programmed courses. A sounder basis on which to judge last summer's program will be the teachers' evaluations of student achievement after the first nine weeks of work on Level II of the language.

I would recommend the self-instructional programs for students who meet the criteria listed above in paragraph three. I would recommend that the program be tried on an experimental basis for such students during the regular school year if at least two consecutive hours per day, preferably in the morning, could be devoted to the course in order that students might complete at least one frame per period. It is my opinion that the programs' structures demand an extended period of unbroken concentration.

Since the participating students were not typical of the average high school class, I would recommend that Yorktown High School repeat the experiment again with a class of highly motivated students with no previous experience in foreign languages, and also with a group of average students with average motivation. The results obtained from these two experimental groups could then be compared with the results from the first group to get a more objective basis for judging the feasibility of using such a program in the high schools.

APPENDIX 2

The Students' Daily ReportsRussian

R-2: Task III, Problem 13, Frame 6

In the previous frames, we were to answer "mo ebka pay" for perfective verbs and "racmo" for imperfectives. We were working for several frames with perfectives only as the correct answers. When I got to Frame 6, one when we answer mostly for imperfectives (racmo), I found that I rejected the perfectives (now the "wrong" answer) with "racmo." I had been conditioned to associate "racmo" with the wrong answer instead of with the imperfectives.

R-3: P2 F5 - August 7

You have no idea how much a release it is to be able to write down all our temper tantrums, so here goes - - - I hate Task IV! I am absolutely furious at problem 3. I can't say those long sentences and why don't you give it in Russian with the English? I hate that man and his lousy family and I'm quitting and going home. (But he didn't. Three weeks later he was still at work.)

R-3: P3 F2

I can't understand this at all! Second try - boy am I proud of myself, I figured out every last word (except for two sentences near the end that I couldn't get! I don't like that woman's voice. Maybe I'm getting there - just maybe!

R-3: Problem 5 - 34-35th day

Dear People:

I am getting very discouraged. I'm not getting much out of this for the time spent. Sentences too long - no vocabulary - not enough time to repeat.

R-4:

Even when you were kind enough to finally include the vocabulary lists, they weren't too helpful, considering the frames include past words which weren't given us. In order to answer as easily as y'all wish us to, it is necessary to memorize every word on the list. Mainly, this is so to make it possible to uncover the real word, amid the mass of prefixes, suffixes, prepositions, declension changes, and other sundry added attractions.

The very problems are impossible! How are we supposed to memorize all the individual irregularities of fifty different verbs, most of which we've either never heard or else have forgotten? A WRITTEN CHART WOULD BE MOST HELPFUL!!

I'm getting extremely discouraged! Right now I'd just like to forget the rest of this task (I've got 5 tapes left, so I'll stick it out) and just buy a book somewhere and learn Russian!

R-5: August 20

As the work becomes more difficult there is a tendency to waste time and take breaks. I find myself doing less than a tape today and I don't think I will finish the course. I would like to know whether it would be better to continue at the same rate and master the material or go faster trying to finish but not necessarily doing my best.

When new verb forms are introduced, I think it would be better and much less irritating if no translations were given in the first one or two frames. I forget the Russian as soon as I hear the English. I spent two hours on problem 10, frame 1, of Task III.

It is really nice to know what you are doing. Problems 7 and 8 are like an oasis.

Spanish

S-1: August 7

It was extremely encouraging today to have the men from the Office of Education come. It's good to know somebody up there cares about us!

No major problems today. I find myself being constantly surprised by how much I am able to understand. The work in Task IV is much more interesting than that horrible Task III - so far.

S-1: August 19

The end is in sight! Things are moving along very smoothly - I feel fairly confident - also I can understand most all they say on the first go around. Some of the stories are really crazy - this makes it interesting.

S-1: August 20

The very worst and most unbearable frames on Unit 4 are the ones like #600 (the first frame in this task). I think they are entirely too long - 25 sentences or so are just too much. Also the sentences are long, difficult to remember (I write them down as best I can), much less say correctly! These frames are taking me as much time as an hour, which for one frame at one sitting is an awful lot!

In the story frames (666-668), they gave us a number of words which we did not know - they had not been used in the previous frames as is usually the case. I don't know how we are expected to learn them if we're not told what they mean! It is a good thing there is a student here who knows Spanish and can tell us these things! It would help if we had dictionaries or something!

S-1: August 21

Praise be, I'm finished. It was really hard work but well worth it, I hope. Ahora, yo hablo español. ¡Me alegro mucho!

S-2: August 20

The review frames are good and were needed.

S-3:

I enjoyed listening to the music very much, but I didn't understand the words very well - even though they were repeated at the beginning of that frame. I noticed that the teacher's manual has the Spanish written out for them. I think this sort of thing would be more of a help than hindrance to us and I wholeheartedly suggest it be used. I found that after the first three weeks of the course I could read Spanish with no difficulty whatsoever and I did not tend to Americanize at all. At first I had a problem with my French interfering, but I am overcoming that disability rapidly. I hope you will seriously consider including the written Spanish in Task IV and also it would be wise to make a list of words that aren't used enough in the tape to be fresh in your mind on ending the course. I have been trying to do this sort of thing for homework. After all, we can only learn so many new words at once!

S-3:

Frame 581: I really had fun doing this one. I'm glad this was put in, no kidding!

Frame 582: I think that sound 18 isn't the r sound as you keep saying it is. I have a feeling that the r sound is either sound 10 or 20. I wrote that sound 18 is ny $\approx$.

S-6:

I hate to tell you but your nice little way of getting us to know when a verb is enos or amos, etc. was a miserable failure. I don't think I've ever gotten it right except by chance.

It's absolutely impossible to remember without some sort of visual image of the word in your mind and when that woman talks so fast I find myself unable to repeat her, understand her, or make the changes. Maybe I'm supposed to see it in grammerlogs, but I don't.

S-6:

This is very satisfying, rewarding, and fun to boot. I am really thrilled to understand as much as I do.

S-6:

Yay - I'm finished!

Comprendo bien, hablo poco, no deletro, pero soy allegro!

APPENDIX 3

The Students' Final Remarks on Self-InstructionRussian

R-1:

At the beginning after the novelty wore off, it became kind of a grind, but looking forward to speaking actual sounds kept me going. I fell behind two or three of the others because I repeated the frames quite a few times, but I felt it was worth it. Several frames in each problem called for too much perfection, I think. Often I made errors just because after so many repetitions of one thing I found my mind wandering and not paying complete attention to the machine. I learned after talking with a Russian I student that we often had learned more in different areas.

One of the main problems was remembering the meanings of the verbs. I think it would have been helpful to have a frame in each problem (besides the first one) using the verbs and making the student recall the meaning. Otherwise, it is very hard to remember the verbs.

Also in Task III at the beginning of almost every problem, Russian phrases were given, then the English, then we were supposed to repeat the Russian. This was hard because after hearing the English you forgot the Russian and if you ignore the English, then you don't get the meaning.

At the beginning of the fourth task all of the sudden, everything is printed and we're expected to know the alphabet. I found that after picking up the alphabet I could read the words, but not by sight as I could almost do in the script. This slowed me down a lot and confused and hindered me quite a lot in the test. If there was a problem explaining and using the printed alphabet, it would smooth the way in the fourth task.

R-2:

As we were told at the start, the course needs a lot of reworking. We found it hard to read printed Russian after learning script. I think there should be a provision for both to be learned. The dialogues weren't terribly interesting. Sufficient vocabulary, I feel, was missing in a high school course. Actually, the vocabulary was not quite the right type for a high school student.

From talking to Russian teachers, etc., I have found that my pronunciation is quite good, due, I'm sure, to the course.

R-3:

I honestly feel that I have learned a remarkable amount of Russian in a relatively short time. Although my vocabulary is not extensive, I have a basic understanding of the language (particularly its "tone" and grammatical structure). This understanding is anything but that of the student who has taken the conventional Russian I course in high school (at least it is different from that of the students in my Russian II class). However, I believe it to be every bit as good, if not better.

The main problem was not technical. It was one of morale. It is difficult to pin down exactly what caused the deep feeling of frustration and lack of feeling of accomplishment which I (and the other members of the group) frequently felt.

I heartily recommend that you insist on padded earphones for the rest of your students and that, if possible, the time spent at each sitting be cut to four hours or two sessions of two and half hours each day.

I know this is contrary to the "Method," but I would have loved to hear some Russians in conversation during the first task. I wanted very much to know what Russian as a "group" of sounds and intonations was like. And if you had taught me how to say "hello, goodbye, please, and thank you" (even though I couldn't have helped learning them incorrectly), I would have been more than overjoyed. As a matter of fact, most of us made a point of finding out how to say these simplest of things long before you taught them to us.

I didn't like the woman with the gruff voice. She was very hard to understand. Task III was not what I would call really difficult; it was tedious. The grammar was not hard, it just seemed rather pointless. I felt that I was forgetting it as fast as I learned it. But I was wrong! I didn't forget! I have to be reminded of some of it, but I have found that I remember and know a lot more grammar than my Russian II classmates.

Comes the fourth task! I didn't appreciate the trick the printers or whoever it was played on us. "Here is all the new vocabulary used in this problem." BLANK PAGE. The first problem was wonderful! I was so proud of myself for understanding! I felt that at last I was really learning Russian. Then I hit the second problem. (The first of many in which the vocabulary was written with invisible ink.) My morale sank to an all time low. I take that back, it was only the beginning of the descent. At the end of the first frame of the second problem (I believe that is one of the ones I spent more than two hours of hard work on) I wrote "I HATE RUSSIAN." on my Task IV booklet.

This was a very unfortunate omission in the booklets. It spoiled the rest of the program for me. It was just too slow to take. I was glad when it was time to quit. I (after all, it is I who didn't learn much vocabulary) am very sorry this happened.

Most of my other criticisms may be found on those delightful little notes we wrote as we went along. I am not being sarcastic! They were delightful! We all had more fun writing our temper tantrums than you will ever know. It really helped relieve the tension and helped "get it out of our systems" when we were mad or frustrated. Just don't take some of the things we wrote too seriously.

The air conditioning was a pleasure! It gets unbelievably muggy in this area. For all my complaints, it has been a summer well spent. I hope we have been able to do as much for you as you have for us.

R-5:

Having just reached Task IV, I don't consider myself fully qualified to pass judgment on the course. On the whole, I am very satisfied with the progress I have made, keeping in mind that I have spent but ten weeks working. However, there are several things which I feel could have been improved upon. The

main one was the lack of a schedule. It would have helped me if time limits had been set for the separate frames, so that I would not have drilled myself on unimportant points of grammar.

The method of teaching vocabulary also left much to be desired. I think certain basic words could have been included in the first two tasks.

R-6:

I believe some improvements of this course could be found in condensing the first task and perhaps completely merging it with the second, teaching to discriminate, write, and pronounce at the same time. Also the third task should be spread out more and written scripts provided. The printed alphabet should be introduced in the third task. After all, the student is continually using the written alphabet on his own. More time should be spent completing the course; a summer isn't enough. Probably 350 hours is a better estimate if one really wants to dissect the fourth task. More vocabulary should be introduced in the third task and instructions given in Russian whenever feasible. The vocabularies, besides being separated according to the parts of speech, should also be arranged either alphabetically or according to the order of occurrence in the story. That story should be something more interesting than an autobiography. Perhaps a short story divided into chapters of suitable length would hold the students' attention better. Despite the many things which, in my humble opinion, could be changed and improved, I have learned an amazing amount about the Russian language, and I believe this course and others like it could help solve the "College Crisis" in some subjects by reducing the need for teachers.

Spanish

S-2:

A major criticism of mine is that substantial knowledge of the language depends on the student completely finishing the course. I was unable to do this in the time available and for this reason what I have obtained are a lot of loose ends not tied together as a unit. I would suggest that the course be changed into a series of module-like sections, complete in themselves, so that the student would have learned more, no matter where he stops.

Secondly, I believe printed vocabulary lists should be included in the notebooks to provide a concrete base of words to use. In the parts of the final test involving this subject I did poorly, for I knew absolutely no words of Spanish. Vocabulary lists might remedy this situation. I also feel that more written material in Spanish should be presented to us so that we are enabled to recognize how the words are spelled and how the different letters are pronounced. Tied in with this is the feeling that in frames where long sentences must be repeated or changed, these sentences should be written out, so as to be seen.

Finally, the question of a supervisor arises. I feel that if the course is well planned, an advisor is not essential. However, we have found that it would be a great help to have a person familiar with the language, and especially with the course, who could answer questions that might be asked. He could also provide needed encouragement where necessary.

S-3:

Many of the exercises in Tasks 2 and 3, and understanding and answering questions in 4 were really difficult to handle, but after we figured out what we were to do and what words meant, we were on solid ground again. I really think that it took a lot of initiative to figure out and perform all that you asked of us in this course.

Task 4 needs much improvement in my opinion. We learn a tremendous vocabulary in a short time, but many words we learned, most first students have never heard of, and many words we are expected to know from first year are skipped. I'm not saying that I expected the two courses to parallel as far as vocabulary goes, completely, but I hardly think I could use words like "killer," "slaughterer," and "hoarse" very often in everyday language.

I would not recommend this course to students who do not work unless under constant supervision of a teacher because when we come to a difficult section we are all more prone to stop than to plug on through it. It is really necessary to have a set time for breaks towards the end of the course because everyone is so restless to finish, but unwilling to work. We found that when a few people took a break soon almost everyone would stop working and the few still plugging away would have to quit because of distractions. At one point we were allowed to take tape recorders home and we discovered we could work better at home. Then we almost didn't have a "class" at school any more.

I certainly appreciate the chance you gave me to learn Spanish. I think the work you have done on this course is to be commended, and it is wonderful that you are interested enough in better teaching methods to want to discover a new and different way of doing things. Thank you again for wanting to help interested students in this way.

Sincerely yours,

S-4:

On the whole, I think that the program is a significant improvement in teaching a language. We learned faster, while covering the necessary material. The fluency is far above that of the average Spanish I student - all we needed was more effective vocabulary.

P.S. All the pre-planned encouragement was not much good.

S-5:

Method of teaching vocabulary - this method is frustrating in that if we hear a word and do not know what it means, we could not find it in a dictionary since we were not taught how to actually write Spanish.

The method of teaching how "good Spanish" sounds was excellent. I know I'll have a better accent because of all the time we spent learning to distinguish between Spanish and non-Spanish sounds.

I am glad I had the opportunity of learning Spanish in this way. It has been fun, at times frustrating, but on the whole a worthwhile and interesting course.

S-6:

Now that I have completed the program, I feel that I have a more objective opinion than the ones expressed in my daily comments, which were often written during periods of frustration. My evaluation of the program at present is far more favorable than it was at several points during the summer when I became angry enough to lose confidence in the overall approach. However, I now feel that the basic approach is excellent and is a tremendous improvement over the traditional method of language instruction. I feel quite confident about my ability to understand Spanish spoken by a native at a normal speed.

I particularly liked the approach to vocabulary in Task IV, as hearing words in context is a far more natural way of learning them than by memorizing lists. However, in many instances I was aided by my knowledge of French, and also by the presence of a Spanish-speaking student who was enrolled in the Russian course.

Although I was impressed with this method and its possibilities, there were a number of things about it that frustrated me. At several points I was so mad that I couldn't continue working that day. Specifically, the questions were often so rapid and garbled that I was incapable of answering. This caused repeated inaccuracy in my work, but I was too angry to keep going back.

The indirect approach to grammar was a little extreme. For example, spending time explaining about "acted-upons" was unnecessary. Since almost everyone of average intelligence is familiar with the term direct object, (and, more important, identifies it as an acted-upon) I don't understand why it is necessary to go to such elaborate lengths to avoid all traces of the traditional grammatical approach even though I understand and agree with the idea of avoiding it for the most part.

APPENDIX 4

The Students' Reactions to the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Test as It Relates to the Self-Instructional CourseRussian

R-1:

Since I hadn't really had much vocabulary, I can't tell how the test corresponded with the vocabulary in the course. I could not understand most of the test. I only caught a few of the words which were familiar. However, if I had gotten farther in Task 4, I probably would have done much better. There was no basic grammar like declensions or conjugations which were just about the only things I knew. I think I got about three or four questions right. I think it would be more encouraging and helpful if a test was prepared from the course. Another problem I found was reading the printed answers in time to answer the questions.

R-2:

Vocabulary - the only thing the test consisted of, and we didn't know any! We haven't had the printed alphabet, so how could we read?! I'll admit the speaking was slow enough, if only we could understand it! I obviously failed!

R-3:

I can't read printing out loud, simply because I've never had to do it. The first part was just guess. I could understand some words but not the sentences, really, and I never read all of the printed answers. I didn't know much of the vocabulary; I didn't have enough time, and I don't speak Russian!

R-4:

The test was nowhere near parallel to the material in the course. The vocabulary was completely different and there was no concentration of grammar on the test, as there was in the course. There was not enough time given to listen and understand it thoroughly. There were many words which we learned through the course which were not on the test. We do know some vocabulary, so we really aren't as stupid as we sounded.

R-5:

This test didn't fit in with the course at all. Having no vocabulary, I think I did fairly well, but considering that I have spent ten weeks on the language, I failed miserably. I think it would have been nice to know the printed alphabet.

Spanish

S-1:

I thought the test was fairly easy - naturally there were things on it I didn't know. I was surprised at how easy the reading was (Parts I and II) as we have never done any of this in the course. Of the two parts, the second, Speaking, was more difficult. I had never taken a test of this type before and also I did not have the vocabulary - no names of animals or prepositions. The best part of the test was its length - short!

S-2:

I felt the test was on the whole a well-made exam; however, parts of it didn't fit the course or my knowledge of the course. We had been given no written Spanish in the course and this was something of a problem. The worst section was the part where we were to make up sentences for I had not reached Task IV and, therefore, did not know any words.

S-3:

I could understand most of the questions in the written part from the background I've had. I think that our course should have more everyday situations in it because we are limited in not knowing the names of most of the things around us. I didn't know the words for floor, on, rain, under, kitchen, living room, etc.

S-4: NOTE: (I have just finished Task III.)

The test is not a good reflection of the first three tasks, except for simple identification of sounds. The only thing that saved me was four years of French vocabulary, which was occasionally usable, and a use of testmanship, to which the test was rather susceptible. It was too, too easy in places on the written part of the test to guess. I had to use French to describe the last two pictures.

S-5:

The writing part wasn't too hard and I think the test had many things which the course had taught us. However, the talking part - GOSH!! That was horrible! The part where we had to repeat after the man was easy, but the describing part was awful. I didn't know many words - not nearly enough to adequately describe the pictures. I found myself wanting so much to use my French vocabulary so that I could describe the pictures instead of just stuttering.

APPENDIX 5

The Teacher's Appraisal of Student Progress in Level II

At this point, the students who participated in the special summer project seem to have the same general skills as the academic year students who use the A-LM material.

Except for R-6, who has had some previous Russian exposure, the summer students speak in sentences with a little more effort. Pronunciation of those who attended the summer class is excellent, except for R-4 who speaks with a French accent. In reading and writing, there seems to be no significant difference. At the beginning of the fall term (1963), they lagged slightly behind in oral comprehension (except for R-6), but this gap is being closed.

The difference in the vocabularies at the beginning of the fall term is significant. A great deal of time was lost in looking up words that were missing in the summer school program. At the beginning of the fall term, the difference in approach was so great that the course was somewhat "tailored" to accommodate the summer participants. Perhaps a better evaluation could be made if the program was of longer sequence, since the students probably lost at least a degree of knowledge that was not covered in the A-LM course. Much of the material covered in summer school probably evaporated through lack of use, since the A-LM materials do not present grammar in the same way as the summer school program did.